



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,093	10/24/2001	Peter R. Paradis	11876/3	1057

7590 08/14/2003

KENYON & KENYON
Suite 600
333 W. San Carlos, Street
San Jose, CA 95110-2711

EXAMINER

BOYCE, ANDRE D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/028,093

Applicant(s)

PARADIS, PETER R.

Examiner

Andre Boyce

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7 have been examined.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim is poorly worded and difficult to interpret. The Examiner suggests rewording the claim for clarification purposes. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2-4 are rendered vague and indefinite, since claim 1 contains two (2) determining steps. As a result, it may be unclear to which determining step the claims refer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3623

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ralston et al (USPN 6,389,454).

As per claim 1, Ralston et al discloses a method for scheduling appointments (scheduling system 10, see Figure 1) comprising, sending a task request from a client to a server system (client 20 request to schedule server 80 and remote schedule servers 38, 48, 58, see column 4, lines 38-42 and column 5, lines 21-24) , the task request including patient identification (see column 4, lines 50-53) and resource identification (i.e., specific facility, see column 4, line 56), determining whether schedules associated with the patient identification and resource identification are stored in local memory to the server system (i.e., as seen in the rescheduling process, wherein server 80 locates scheduling information, see column 6, lines 30-35), loading the associated patient schedule and resource schedule from a database into the local memory (servers 38, 48, 58 access data from facilities 35, 45, 55, see column 5, lines 24-27), and determining available times for the resource schedule at the server system (server 80 generates appointment candidates, see column 5, lines 27-28).

As per claim 2, Ralston et al discloses the determining step beginning from a start timestamp provided in the task request for a period of time (client appointment preference data, including date and time, see column 4, lines 55-56).

As per claim 3, Ralston et al discloses the determining step of moving to a next time period of time if not available times for the resource schedule are found (determined via the resource availability mask, see column 4, lines 41-43) .

As per claim 4, Ralston et al discloses wherein after the determining step, at least one available time being transmitted from the server to the client (see column 5, lines 63-65).

Claim 5 is rejected based upon the rejection of claim 1, since it is the system claim corresponding to the method.

As per claim 6, Ralston et al discloses a client coupled to the server system via a transmission medium (transmission medium 70, see column 4, lines 41-43).

As per claim 7, Ralston et al discloses a database coupled to the server system (data from facilities 35, 45, 55, see column 5, lines 24-27).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-Schloss et al (USPN 5692125) discloses events checked at a scheduling time to insure certain conditions are satisfied.

-Detjen et al (USPN 5970466) discloses a computer implemented scheduling system.

-Mayhak, Jr. et al (US 2001/0051888) discloses managing and scheduling employees to work in a clinic.

-Mason et al (US 2002/0016721) discloses automating record keeping.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre Boyce whose telephone number is (703) 305-1867. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

adb

adb
August 9, 2003

Romain Janty
Art Unit 3623